

American Renaissance

There is not a truth existing which I fear, or would wish unknown to the whole world.

— Thomas Jefferson

Vol. 8, No. 9

September 1997

Christianity – Pro and Con

The AR readers' survey, published in the previous issue, reveals considerable disagreement among subscribers about the effects of Christianity on the struggle to preserve Western Civilization. AR itself takes no position on this question, but in this issue two thoughtful readers offer alternate views.

I. How Christianity Harms the Race


by Michael W. Masters

"The Roman empire did not die any differently, though, it's true, more slowly, whereas this time we can expect a more sudden conflagration. . . . Christian charity will prove itself powerless. The times will be cruel."

— Jean Raspail, introduction to the 1985 edition of *The Camp Of The Saints*

Christianity, which many believe to be the noblest moral system ever conceived, must now share blame for the dissolution of the West. A faith that once served as an anchor for Western civilization has become a source for the same self-flagellating guilt that typifies liberalism. Today, Christianity's public expression differs only cosmetically from Marxism in its attitudes towards economic redistribution, equality and racial integration.

How has Christianity sunk so low—and our people with it? The answer is that it has subverted inbred traits of altruism that help family and tribe survive, and has transmuted those traits into agents of passivity and surrender. Christianity has universalized altruism, thus stripping us of our defense against multiracialism. Today's Christianity drives us to betray our own interests to whoever



asks. At the same time, a preoccupation with eternal reward in the world to come blinds some Christians to the consequences of their actions today.

Christianity's Decline

Loss of racial loyalty is recent. For centuries, race consciousness posed no moral dilemma to Christians. That "old-time religion" was good enough for Charles Martel when he smashed the Muslim invasion of Europe in 732

Christianity has universalized altruism, thus stripping us of our defense against multiracialism.

at Tours. It was good enough for Pope Urban II when he launched the Crusades in 1095. It was good enough for Columbus and Magellan, who claimed newly-discovered lands in the name of both king and faith. It was good enough for European colonial

masters who ruled millions of non-whites, untroubled by egalitarian scruples.

Christianity's divorce from racial consciousness was both sudden and recent. Only in the 20th century did "secular humanism" infiltrate virtually every mainline Christian organization. By the 1960s, organized Christianity was working hand in hand with organized Judaism to dismantle the South's self-protective wall of racial hierarchy. The universalist campaign continues to this day, with ordination of women and soon, one fears, homosexuals.

What transformed the church? The problem is that Christian dogma has always contained dangerous moral precepts that undermine the natural instinct for group preservation. These precepts may be summarized thus: Sacrifice yourself today for the benefit of others, buoyed by faith in an "eternal reward."

In earlier times, this idea posed little danger to white survival because it was preached by whites living in an almost all-white world. Today, on a crowded planet filled with envious Third-World people, its consequences are lethal. The mentality of sacrifice has resulted in an inability to assert the imperative of survival—an imperative that puts family, tribe and nation at the center of moral life.

Christianity must therefore share a major part of the blame for the abnormal belief that we must commit racial suicide in order to be "moral." This is not, of course, to lay blame solely on Christianity, but neither should Christianity escape examination solely because it has long been the guardian of the moral beliefs of Western peoples.

Continued on page 3



Letters from Readers

Sir — I found the readers' survey fascinating and read with greatest interest the names of people readers proposed as having helped or harmed our race. I was disgusted to see that Adolph Hitler leads the list of non-Americans who have presumably helped the white race. It is difficult for me to imagine a worse choice. Even if one agreed with *every one* of Hitler's objectives, he failed to achieve them. As far as our race is concerned, his only real effect was to demonize the very measures necessary for our survival. His legacy has been an unparalleled disaster for our race, and if we go to the wall he will bear a considerable part of the blame.

Cullen Atwood, Fort Worth, Tex.

Sir — Congratulations on bringing on Glayde Whitney as a regular contributor. He is just what we needed to round out an already excellent magazine. Not only are his articles brief, up to the minute, and to the point, he provides references for the doubters. As Casey Stengel used to say, "you can look it up." Whatever you did to get Prof. Whitney to join in the fun, keep it up.

R. Travis Osborne, Athens, Ga.

We publish the following letter as a contrast to the O Tempora item on page 12, "Patriots All."

Sir — My father left northern Greece in 1912 in order to escape poverty and Turkish atrocities. He went to Panama and worked on the canal until its completion and then

came north and joined the U.S. Army during the First World War. Afterwards he lived and worked in San Diego, Monterey, and finally San Francisco. He taught himself to speak, write, and read English and never accepted a dime of aid, even during the worst of times. His respect and regard for America, its ideals and culture was boundless. This elegant, productive, gentle man was buried 20 years ago with the U.S. flag on his casket—in accordance with his repeated requests.

Art Johns, Stockton, Cal.

Sir — I have never seen a more devastating and effective attack on the advantages of "diversity" than Jared Taylor's cover story in the July-August issue. He describes himself as "shooting fish in a barrel," but he is too modest. Original and insightful observations may seem obvious *after* someone has put them into words, but it takes real talent to describe something that is right in front of all of our noses but that no one else has quite managed to see. What a pity that Mr. Taylor's essay cannot be reprinted in a publication more people will read.

Alice Hopewell, Morgantown, W.V.

Sir — As an addendum to your June discussion of political correctness in the science magazines, let us not forget *Scientific American's* appalling treatment of *The Bell Curve*.

Instead of commissioning a dispassionate scientific appraisal of the book, the editors gave it to Leon Kamin, a long-time enemy of Richard Herrnstein. In *A Question of Intel-*

ligence, Daniel Seligman calls Mr. Kamin "a tireless critic of [IQ] testing" and describes *Not in Our Genes*, which Mr. Kamin coauthored, as "perhaps the most detailed expression of the extreme environmental case." Mr. Seligman recounts how in one instance—concerning the purported government mismeasurement of Jewish immigrants' intelligence—Mr. Herrnstein publicly accused Mr. Kamin of, as Mr. Seligman puts it, "intellectual fraud." Predictably, Mr. Kamin trashed *The Bell Curve*.

Why did *Scientific American* turn to him? Clearly the editors had already made up their minds about the slant they wanted—though "slant" is not a word one likes to associate with a magazine of science.

Ted Klein, New York City

Sir — There has been some speculation in AR about the reasons for the white man's decline. After years of wondering, I have begun to think there can only be a biological explanation—or least an explanation that lies so close to the heart of Western Civilization that it might as well be biological.

Only something very deep can explain the *universality* of white capitulation. Historical or cultural explanations are really plausible only for the United States—you actually *are* "a nation of immigrants," and you exploited blacks and dispossessed Indians. The latter acts can still be thrown in your faces as recent, still-living racial sins.

But why did the Swedes give hundreds of millions of dollars to the anti-Apartheid forces? Why do we British practice affirmative action? Why is the France-for-the-French leader Jean-Marie LePen still a pariah? Why do the Dutch import throngs of Caribbean blacks and Surinamese? Why can't the Germans send home the Turkish guest workers?

No European nation has a history like yours to make it vulnerable to multi-racial appeals, yet each practices the same kind of slow self-slaughter. Although an inherent tendency towards degeneration violates Nature's rules, what else can account for this universal—and exclusively white—phenomenon?

Joseph Pitfield, Birmingham, England



American Renaissance

Jared Taylor, Editor
Thomas Jackson, Assistant Editor
George McDaniel, Web Page Editor

American Renaissance is published monthly by the New Century Foundation. NCF is governed by Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code; contributions to it are tax deductible.

Subscriptions to American Renaissance are \$20.00 per year. For first class postage, add \$8.00. Subscriptions to Canada (first class) and overseas (surface mail) are \$30.00. Overseas airmail subscriptions are \$40.00. Foreign subscribers should send U.S. dollars or equivalent in convertible bank notes. Back issues are \$2.50 each.

Please make checks payable to: American Renaissance, P. O. Box 527 Oakton, Virginia 22124. ISSN No. 1086-9905, Telephone: (703) 716-0900, Facsimile: (703) 716-0932, Electronic Mail: AR@amren.com Web Page address: <http://www.amren.com>

Continued from page 1

What then, are the beliefs that characterize today's self-destructive Christianity? They are altruism and universalism. These two beliefs so dominate public Christian discourse that they are contradicted from no more than a handful of pulpits—even in the American South, where ministers once invoked God in defense of segregation.

Altruism

Let us first consider altruism, the Good Samaritan reflex. The Golden Rule—which is the ideal of Christian conduct—exalts altruism, or acts beneficial to others without regard for one's own interests. If followed by everyone, surely the Golden Rule would produce world peace and harmony.

In fact, universal altruism has unintended consequences, some of which are shocking to Christian sensibilities. Biologist and human ecologist, Garrett Hardin, explained why in his 1968 essay, "The Tragedy of the Commons:" "*Conscience is self-eliminating from a population.*" (The tragedy of the commons is the tendency to over-exploit any resource that is available for all to share but that exacts little or no cost from any one user.) Prof. Hardin first makes his point with respect to voluntary birth control, then generalizes it:

"People vary. Confronted with appeals to limited breeding, some people will undoubtedly respond to the plea more than others. Those who have more children will produce a

larger fraction of the next generation than those with more susceptible consciences The argument here has been stated in the context of the population problem, but it applies equally well to any instance in which society appeals to an individual exploiting a commons to restrain himself for the general good—by means of his conscience. To make such an appeal is to set up a selective system that works toward the elimination of conscience from the race."

Conscience is eliminated because it is not randomly distributed in a population but is to some degree inherited from parents. Even if willingness to restrict breeding for the good of all is only slightly heritable, an appeal to conscience will steadily remove it from the population. The

A self-sacrificing conscience and unfettered altruism, are self-eliminating.

fact that *self-sacrificing* conscience, or in a broader sense, unfettered altruism, is self-eliminating is a fundamental truth with which any lasting moral order must contend.

There must be a dual code of morality—one for one's own group and another for everyone else. Harsh as this may sound both to Christians and non-Christians, nature will inexorably eliminate the flawed genes of any group that fails to make this distinction.

In fact, we take the dual code for granted. We devote much of our lives

to rearing our own children but we ignore the children of strangers—an obvious double standard. We save the lives of our comrades in battle but we kill the enemy—another double standard. The universal altruism of the Golden Rule undercuts both forms of group loyalty. After all, we might well wish that strangers *would* devote themselves to our children. If we took the Golden Rule seriously we might then devote ourselves to the children of others and neglect our own. Likewise the Golden Rule might require us to betray our own side to the enemy, inasmuch as that is what we might want done for us. Clearly, groups and individuals that behaved this way would not pass on their perverted morality to many descendants.

Some will object that Prof. Hardin's prediction about the self-elimination of conscience is demonstrable false, since it still exists. Nevertheless, what matters is the time scale. Conscience-obsessed Western man is declining in numbers, and his morality and behavior are declining with him.

Universalism

Today's Christians have confused the Biblical injunction to be our brother's keeper—a moral code based on blood kinship—with the opposite notion that every human on earth is our brother. More than a century ago, Pierre-Joseph Proudhon observed, "If everyone is my brother, I have no brothers." Prof. Hardin adds: "Universalism is altruism practiced *without discrimination* of kinship, acquaintanceship, shared values, or propinquity in time or space."

Biblical testimony on universalism is, in fact, mixed. The Old Testament praises altruism only within the community, and commands the Children of Israel to shun other peoples. For example, Deuteronomy 7:2-3 reads:

"2 When the Lord thy God shall deliver them before thee, thou shalt smite them, and utterly destroy them; thou shalt make no covenant with them, nor shew mercy unto them; 3 Neither shalt thou make marriages with them; thy daughter thou shalt not give unto his son, nor his daughter shalt thou take unto thy son. . . ."

One finds national and presumably racial separatism in the New Testament as well. Acts 17:26 reads, "[He]

hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth, and hath determined the times before appointed and the bounds of their habitation." Matthew 25:31-32, in which Christ speaks of his future reign, adds: "When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit on the throne of his glory: And before him shall be gathered all nations; and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats."

But all too often the New Testament, particularly in the letters of Paul, promotes universalism. Today's Christians love to cite passages such as Galatians 3:28-29:

"28 There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond or free, male or female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus. 29 And if ye be Christ's then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise."

Christianity Today

It is on the basis of passages like this that Christianity has abandoned the defense of our people and has become an accomplice of those who would displace us. The National Council of Churches donated money to Marxist revolutionaries in Africa—revolutionaries who sometimes murdered white missionaries. The Southern Baptist Convention's leadership recently bowed before its one black member, apologizing for slavery and racism. Typically, the black member showed little gratitude for the gesture, complaining that not nearly enough had been done to alleviate the lingering effects of slavery.

Like their atheist counterparts, Christian trend-setters preach what amounts to the dissolution of the white race. Christian Coalition founder, Pat Robertson, supports more immigration from "south of the border" because the newcomers are nominally "Christian," support "family values," and are "our kind of voters."

Mr. Robertson seems not to realize that Mestizo Christianity is often based on "revolution theology," and its symbol is a Christ-figure with arms upraised, brandishing an AK-47 assault rifle. Revolution theology will help create "Aztlán," the Bronze Continent, the new home of La Raza—

literally, "the race." Even a nominally Christian Aztlán would effectively decapitate Christianity as Mr. Robertson understands it, since



Too much sacrifice.

altruistic universalist Christianity is largely a habit of Western people.

Billy Graham goes one further and says that the only solution to our race problem is for us to breed with non-whites until human differences disappear. He says we must take alien peoples into our hearts and our homes and, yes, "into our marriages."

With ministers preaching racial suicide, Christianity may now be more of a threat to our survival than liberalism. At least with liberalism, one recognizes the enemy. But when Christian leaders take liberal positions, they leave the flock defenseless. Ralph Reed and Billy Graham are our opponents, no less than Bill Clinton and Ted Kennedy.

The *Wall Street Journal* recently ran a front page story titled "Racial Reconciliation Becomes a Priority For the Religious Right:"

"[T]he most energetic element of society [today] addressing racial divisions may also seem the most unlikely: the religious right.

"Across the country, conservative congregations and denominations, while sticking to other stringent principles of conservative religious thinking such as the proscription of homosexuality and abortion, are

embracing a concept called 'biblical racial reconciliation'—a belief that as part of their efforts to please God, they are required by Scripture to work for racial harmony."

If even "the Christian right" has become part of the rout of traditional Christianity; it is because the New Testament opens the door to universalism. Oswald Spengler wrote that "Christian theology is the grandmother of Bolshevism," and indeed, ministers routinely preach the "social" gospel, invoking a universalism that differs little from the agenda of the radical left.

A Chimera

Yet ironically, the universalist goal is a chimera. Since those who displace us do not, by definition, maintain our moral standards—for if they did they would not be replacing us—our flawed moral system will vanish with us. As Prof. Hardin explains in his 1982 essay, "Discriminating Altruisms," "[universalism] cannot survive in competition with discrimination." A group that practices universal altruism—and whites are the only group that does—cannot compete against groups that do not.

Some Christians would say that none of this matters because believers will one day ascend to their reward in Heaven. However, the vision of Heaven can subvert the imperative of survival. If, in their fervor to enter Heaven, Christians fail to have children or to build a nation in which their children can maintain their way of life, the race will not continue. It is worth noting that Heaven is an entirely *personal* reward, which can be pursued at the expense of family, tribe or race. Selfishness thus joins universalism in modern Christianity, completely inverting nature's design of loyalty to family and tribe.

Christianity's flaws did not threaten us until technology and ideology made their consequences felt on a worldwide scale. Now, our moral code *must* renounce universalism and emphasize our own survival. Unless we adopt moral beliefs in keeping with the realities of today's demographics, we will not survive the mounting wave of Third World immigration, procreation and miscegenation. It is in this sense that, as Jean Raspail says,

"Christian charity will prove itself powerless." Christian charity can hardly stop a demographic displacement that it helped set in motion.

Christians must return to that "old-time religion." Today's version is destroying us. ●

Michael W. Masters is the author of "The Morality of Survival," which appeared in the July and August 1995 issues of AR. His articles have appeared in *The Social Contract*, *Southern Patriot*, and *The Citizens Informers*.

II. A Defense of the Faith

by Victor Craig

There is a breathtakingly simple question that haunts those of us who are loyal to European Man and his culture: What has happened to us? Why has a once-proud and courageous people that stretched its dominion from Europe to North America to Australia simply abandoned its heritage and surrendered to aliens? For many, the prime culprit, or at least a major accessory, is the Christian faith.

I believe this blame is misplaced. Over the centuries not only did Christianity preside over vigorous expressions of racial nationalism, it created the very culture that men of the West claim to defend. Far from causing the decline, Christianity has itself been debased along with so many other principles that once guided us. Christianity must therefore be rescued and revived, not reviled.

What we now think of as "liberalism" rose up as a force independent from and hostile to the Church, and opposed the social order over which the Church presided. In fact, in the longer sweep of history, the Church has been one of the final citadels of resistance against assaults on tradition and the social and moral decay that follow. The same revolutionary forces that undermined Europe's civilizational and racial identity have only recently succeeded in undermining its religious identity. Therefore, to condemn the Church for what amounts to an eleventh-hour conversion to a movement it has adamantly opposed

for generations is short-sighted and unfair. No student of history can argue that Christianity is somehow "inherently" defective in ways that weaken the race.

I would argue further that men who claim to be fighting for their race and culture have gone over to the enemy when they attack Christianity. As Hilaire Belloc said, "The faith is Europe and Europe is the faith." The two are inseparable. It is far better for a man to believe, but even if he cannot, respect for his ancestors and love of his people should put him firmly in the camp of the saints. For the race to survive, we must restore its ancient and defining faith.

The Rise of Liberalism

Ever since the French Revolution—even from the time of the Renaissance and Reformation—power-



ful forces have been changing Christianity just as they changed Europe as a whole. "Liberalism" as we conceive of it today, begins with the rejection of hierarchy. It is the sworn enemy of class, of the importance of lineage as manifested in monarchy and aristocracy, and of the myriad differences that distinguish all people. And yet hierarchies of all kind were once central to European thought and were wholly sanctioned by the Church. For most of its history, Christianity has been the essential ballast against egalitarian experiments.

Traditional forces stoutly opposed universal rights, pluralism, democracy, etc. and among those forces was to be found inevitably the Catholic Church. Pope Pious IX's 1864 *Syllabus of Errors* is a strong and eloquent

example of commitment to the Old Order. Its list of the "principal errors of our time" concludes with the most famous: the mistake of thinking that "the Roman Pontiff can and should reconcile himself to and agree with progress, liberalism, and modern civilization." Protestants tended to be more receptive to "liberalism" than Catholics, but they too long opposed tampering with the sexual, moral, and racial norms of society.

One could argue that the success of counter-revolution in Europe between the First and Second World Wars was a sign that liberalism could be turned back, but this was the last real success. Even at this relatively late date, when confronted with the agonizing decision of whom to support in the Second World War, traditional Christianity often held its nose and supported the Axis. Whatever one may make of this choice, it certainly demonstrates that there was nothing in the old faith inherently at odds with racial theory or policy.

It was nevertheless the upheavals of the two wars that finally ended the struggle between revolution and the Old Order. It was only after these great struggles that ideas of equality—originally applied only to the *men* of one's own people—were extended to women, children, people of other races, and to hosts of ever-proliferating victim groups.

Although liberalism has been ascendant everywhere since 1945, even in the post-war era it has been traditional Christianity that provided spirited defenses for everything from the preservation of French Algeria to the support of Apartheid and Southern segregation. It is only the final absurdities of liberalism that have had the support of organized Christianity.

Those who talk of the "inherent" flaws of Christianity seem to forget that it has taken a very long time for those alleged flaws to reveal themselves. The Latin Vulgate dates from the 4th century AD, and by the mid-6th century the complete Canon in a single cover was in common use. For 14 centuries European man has lived and conquered with this Bible in his hand. It is implausible to argue that it suddenly revealed its true, race-destroying character only in the last few years.

Of course, as liberalism invaded the church it established a new understanding of Christianity. Mainstream churches have now jettisoned any teaching of the old faith that they found incompatible with the current *zeitgeist*. A great many "Christians" now openly reject the clearest possible Biblical condemnation of homosexuality, for example, and some are so brazen as to question publicly the existence of God. Even the Catholic Church has been in an extraordinary rush to abandon centuries of dogma and practice in the four decades since Vatican II.

This new, liberal Christianity, which is really just liberalism dressed up with a few of the old forms, is now an integral part of the juggernaut that has produced a multi-racial America and that preaches immigration, integration, and capitulation. The brotherhood of man now means that all men must live together in the same country with no distinctions.

There are still pockets of Christian resistance. The old Christianity is believed and practiced off the beaten path by small groups and congregations. Organized Christianity, on the other hand, is still organized, but it is far from Christian. The new Christianity is as dangerous to real Christianity as it is to the survival of European Civilization and the white race.

The Old South

The two societies that offered more than token resistance to post-World War II multi-racialism were the American South and the South Africa of the Afrikaner-led National Party. These were both highly traditional Christian communities. They found nothing in their faith to curb racial awareness.

In fact, the literature of race that grew out of both these cultures (often written by clergymen) may still be profitably referred to today. It is stunning how prophetic the Christians of those two societies were in their predictions of the long-term effects of racial mixing. They did not have the scientific evidence for racial differences we have today, but the common-sense observations of these deeply Christian folk arrived at the same truths about race that the Jensens,

Rushtons, and Levins would express in technical terms much later.

In the pre-Civil War South, slavery was thought to be a moral institution. However jarring this may be to modern sensibilities, Christianity endorsed an explicitly racial concept of bondage. Clergymen frequently invoked Noah's curse upon his son Ham, who was to be "a slave of slaves to his brothers." They also referred to the clear acceptance of and detailed regulation of slavery in the Old Testa-



ment. As Richard Fuller, an ante-bellum South Carolina Baptist declared in a dialogue with Francis Wayland, president of Brown University, "What God sanctioned in the Old Testament and permitted in the New cannot be sin."

The religious defense of racialism continued in the post-slavery period as a defense of segregation. Robert Lewis Dabney is probably the most famous of the thousands of preachers who found a Biblical basis for white supremacy. In his more than 50 years of professorships and pastorates he opposed everything from black suffrage to black schooling. The former was a "fatal innovation" that would eventually "destroy both American liberty and civilization." The latter would "only prepare the way for the abhorred fate, amalgamation."

Richard H. Rivers was the author of *Elements of Moral Philosophy*, which served as the standard work on ethics for Methodists. In it, he wrote that the duties of whites to blacks "are no longer the duties of masters to slaves. They are, however, the duties of superiors to inferiors."

Many Southerners today recall how, even during the fervor of the 1950s and early 1960s, the battle to preserve segregation was often led by clergymen. Of course, by then

mainstream Christianity had become so weakened by liberalism that many Southern clergymen could be found on the other side as well.

Universalism

The Christian is indeed summoned to spread the message to all men, and it is Christianity's universalism that critics point to as its central flaw. However, universalism does not require equality. Among the Afrikaner, when the family gathered for prayer and Bible study it was customary for the black servants also to attend, but to sit on the floor. A concern for another man's soul does not imply that I think him my equal. He may be superior or inferior to me in any number of ways. Though not blind to his station, I am still summoned to care for his spiritual and even his material well-being, and a case can certainly be made for the view that apartheid did more for the black and colored man than will be done by self-rule.

In the end, the question is one of identity. May a Christian have any identity other than that of Christ's servant? May he be loyal to nation, culture or race? Traditional, European Christianity encouraged all these loyalties whereas liberal Christianity denies them. The denial is not only a recent aberration, it is a departure from Biblical teaching.

It is true that for the man devoted to the Lord, race will not be his only loyalty or even his first, but this must not render him suspect in the eyes of men who do not believe. Of the 391 readers who responded to the *American Renaissance* poll, 262 believe in God and 177 practice a religion. Of these, 167 are Christians. Their numbers, which amount to almost half the AR readers who responded, show that a *true* Christian's love of God need not dim his love for his people.

A Challenge to Non-believers

I would go farther and say that not only should Christianity not render a man suspect, Christians might even be justified in doubting the conviction of racialists who explicitly reject the faith. I know that among some non-believers there can be a tendency to mock those who believe, to think of us

as somehow not intellectually complete. With all due respect, let me offer the view that perhaps no man of the West can be complete if he is *not* a Christian.

I do not here intend to issue a challenge to believe. I suspect that many racialsists will always be non-believers because it takes a powerfully skeptical mind to resist liberalism's incessant propaganda, and in any case, faith does not come from the pages of magazines. Instead I appeal to tradition, history, and the beauty of what is uniquely European.

Our culture is so saturated with Christianity that the two simply cannot be separated. Can a man who claims to speak for European Man appreciate the B-Minor Mass in anything like the manner Bach intended if he does not share Bach's faith? Can a true man of the West look upon Notre Dame cathedral with nothing more than an art critic's eye? Can today's Southerners, who claim to be so proud of their Confederate ancestors, understand the minds of Stonewall Jackson or Robert E. Lee if Christianity is to them nothing more than an alien superstition? The art, the literature, the music, the sculpture, the history, the very essence of our heritage is suffused with faith and the symbols of faith. To strip Christianity from Western Civilization is to tear out its heart. Christianity is so characteristic of Western man that for centuries Europe was known as "Christendom."

How can whites claim to be defenders of a people and of a race and yet scoff at the deepest convictions of their ancestors? How can they speak of "preservation" when they oppose the faith that has for so long defined and guided our race? Today's whites are the final link in a chain of

faith that reaches more than a thousand years into the past. If they can throw off their ancient religion so easily what else might they cast aside? Their language, their culture, *their race*? Should we not be suspicious of men who invoke the wisdom of their ancestors' views on blacks or immigrants but who reject the spiritual foundation on which their ancestors built their lives—who reject what their ancestors would have said was the *source and strength* of all wisdom?

To be sure, it is not given to all men—not even to all good men—to believe. To those men I would say: If you love your race and its heritage, do not mock the Church. Respect it, honor it, and even—yes—*join* it. As a duty to your ancestors, in solidarity with the ancient traditions of your people, as an act of participation in the faith that suffuses our culture, stand with the believers even if, in your hearts, you do not believe.

I know that what I propose is difficult, even shocking. It is contrary to today's cult of the individual. It requires that personal qualms be set aside in the name of something greater. But for those who think in terms of race it should not be difficult to understand that there *is* something greater.

Those of you who were reared in the faith will find unsuspected solace in the familiar music and liturgy of your childhoods. Also, churches are not subject to civil rights laws and many are therefore the only fully segregated public institutions in America. Support the faith, work to restore its dignity and traditions and, eventually, the faith may become your support.

Those who do not believe should remember that it is a matter of pride among the liberals to flaunt their

atheism. This is because they see religion as one of those loathsome things from the past, like "racism" and "sexism," that must be destroyed. It is no coincidence that Communism persecuted the church. Therefore, do not side with the Bolsheviks against your own people. Whether you call yourself a racist or a conservative or a reactionary, if you join the assault on Christianity you league yourself with those who hate Western man. It is precisely now, when the crisis is worst, that men of the West must march together and be guided by the same light.

Rather than turn their backs on the faith of their fathers, non-believers should ask themselves whether our people can be saved if our faith is not restored. Can it be a coincidence that racial consciousness in the West collapsed at precisely the moment liberalism invaded the Church? There have been many deeply religious European societies that took pride in race and nation. Has there even been a non-religious one that did? Do we even know whether whites can build a racially conscious society on material grounds alone? Those who think of Christianity as an obstacle and a stumbling block should ask themselves whether it may be that Christianity must be cured of liberalism before the West can be cured.

Europe is the faith and the faith Europe. Those who would be faithful to Europe but not to the faith will find that Europe cannot be Europe without the faith. Even if some biologically authentic remnant of the race succeeds in securing a material corner of the earth, it will have established a nation without an identity and a body without a soul. ●

All You Need to Know About White People

Frances Cress Welsing, *The Isis Papers: The Keys to the Colors*, Third World Press
1991, 301 pp., \$14.95 (soft cover)

Exploring the outer limits of black racial thinking.

reviewed by Thomas Jackson

Frances Cress Welsing, a black psychiatrist and pediatrics professor,

is the originator of a "unified field theory" that purports to explain every detail of the wicked behavior of whites. Over the years, she has written on various aspects of the problem, and her book, *The Isis Papers*, is a collection of her basic writings. Needless to

say, her theories run from the goofy to the grotesque, but evidence plays only a minor role in black explanations of white "racism." After all, black Muslims presumably believe that whites were created 6,000 years ago on the

island of Patmos by the mad black scientist Yacub.

Is it worth the bother to look into the nutty ideas of eccentric blacks? Unlike other nutty books AR has reviewed, *The Isis Papers* does not even have the respectability of a mainstream "white" publisher. Nevertheless, the book has been reprinted seven times in six years, and has stayed for years on the Blackboard African American Bestsellers List. In 1990, the *Los Angeles Times* praised Dr. Welsing for being "the first scientist to psychoanalyze white racism." In the early 1990s, the rap group Public Enemy acknowledged her as an inspiration and sent music reviewers copies of her work along with advance tapes of their new album, "Fear of a Black Planet." Black student groups frequently invite Dr. Welsing to speak on college campuses, where she is reportedly received with standing ovations. Moreover, she was one of the early proponents of what has come to be called "melanin theory," which is now so popular that even the squeamish white media can no longer ignore it.

Mutant Albinos

According to Dr. Welsing, the basic trouble with whites is that they are "genetic mutant defectives," the despised albino offspring of Africans. They appeared by mistake thousands of years ago, were abandoned by their horrified black parents, and migrated north to Europe. They have since discovered that not only are they a numerical minority in the world, their traits are genetically recessive. As a result:

"The white global collective . . . lives each day and each minute of every hour in the continuous fear of white annihilation by the global majority of genetic dominants. This fundamental fear of albino isolation, abandonment and genetic annihilation, is at the core of Western civilization—a civilization structured to ensure white genetic survival."

"Western civilization" is just another word for white supremacy, which is what whites must practice to avoid "genetic annihilation." A "kill or be killed" sentiment explains why whites control and oppress all non-whites.

Curiously, the oppressive mission of the "white global collective" is not motivated by a sense of superiority but by one of deep inferiority. Consciously or unconsciously, whites know they are defective mutants. They know they suffer from "an inadequacy rooted in the inability to produce melanin." What is more:

"The destructive and aggressive behavioral patterns displayed throughout the world by white peoples towards all non-white peoples is the evidence of the inner hate, hostility and rejection they feel towards themselves and of the deep self-alienation that has evolved from their genetic inadequacy."

This is the heart of the "unified field theory" of white wickedness. Whites are envious of the ability of non-whites to produce melanin, and compensate for their own deficiency by oppressing non-whites. This is why they deny jobs to blacks, stuff them with drugs, put guns in their hands, give them bad schools, claim they have low IQs, infect them with AIDS, kill them, etc.

But why does Dr. Welsing think whites unconsciously want to be black? She points out that they expose themselves to the sun so as to burn away their disgusting whiteness. They use makeup to tint their colorless faces. When they want to feel tough and manly they dress in black leather. When they want their women to look sexy they dress them in black underwear. Whites also acknowledge the superiority of melanin when they clothe in black their most respected people—judges, priests, nuns, and academics in robes. Therefore, the more whites degrade blacks, the more



Passing on the inadequacy.

they are projecting their own inadequacies onto people they know to be superior.

At the same time, whites have perversely arranged the world in such a way as to maintain their fleeting and defective whiteness. Because the child of any white/non-white union is non-white, they have set up elaborate

mechanisms to hold at bay the greatest threat of all to white existence: the black man. Any non-white man is a threat, but since blacks have the most melanin and are the most sexually potent they are the most dangerous. They are also therefore the *most attractive*, and white men have an "intense fear of the Black male's capacity to fulfill the greatest longing of the white female—that of conceiving and birthing a product of color." (Dr. Welsing likes to write "black" with a capital B while leaving "white" in lower case.)

Moreover, the reason whites have built elaborate taboos around sex and think it "dirty" is that for them it produces only "albino mutants." Non-whites do not think sex is dirty because it brings forth new generations rich in melanin.

At a more prosaic level, it is because whites lack melanin that they are "unable" to live among non-whites: "[T]his inability is seen as the apparent psychological discomfort experienced by whites in situations where, in confronting their neighbors of color, they must face their color inadequacy daily." Whites herd together so as not to have to lay eyes on their superiors.

Melanin deficiency also causes "sexism," which is a distinctly white problem: "Feeling inferior to 'non-white' males and *females*, the white male said to the white female, 'Well, at least I am going to be superior to you.'" [emphasis in the original]

Symbols of Sex

Virtually every chapter of *The Isis Papers* says something about sex, and Dr. Welsing sees sex and its symbols everywhere. For example, the Washington Monument, the tallest structure in Washington, DC, is obviously a great white penis meant to assert white mastery. Bull fighting is a ritual of white resistance against non-white sexual and genetic superiority, in which a white man kills a black bull and cuts off its tail or ears in an act of symbolic castration. Smoking is nothing more than the manipulation of phallic symbols, in which *small white* cigarettes and *large black* cigars correctly symbolize white fears. Smoking can never be banned in America because whites cannot give up the habit

of manipulating the symbols of their genetic and genital inadequacy.

A fascination with guns (more phallic symbols) is another way whites compensate for inadequacy. The white man likes to go hunting—he especially enjoys killing animals with dark skins—and thereby “stays in physical and psychological readiness for killing Black and other non-white males” Guns, too, cannot be banned in America because whites are psychologically dependent on them.

Sports are a rich source of symbols, since ball games are sublimated versions of the great genetic and genital world power struggle. Dr. Welsing emphasizes that the *big* balls for basketball and football are black or brown while the *small* balls for golf, tennis, and ping pong are white. When whites are young and vigorous, they try to play with the big black balls, but are defeated by big black men. In old age, whites console themselves with small white balls. In bowling, a giant black ball scatters helpless white phallic symbols.

Basketball and football also symbolize white fear and fascination at the prospect of black men having sex with white women. The brown basketball goes into a round, white, vagina-like net, and brawny players kicks the black football through the symbolic, upraised legs of a white woman.

Christ on the cross is one of the most complete and powerful symbols of white supremacy.

Chocolate candy is, of course, a symbol of sweet sex with black people. White men give it as a gift in the hope that their wives and girlfriends will be satisfied with an edible substitute, but also in the hope that some of the glamour and potency of blackness will be transferred to them.

Christ on the cross is one of the most complete and powerful symbols of white supremacy. The cross, which is almost always black or brown, is an abstract representation of the feared black man's genitals. A weak and dying white man is crucified to the giant genitals, but since the latter are removed from the body, they symbolize castration. Thus the crucifix is a symbol both of the central threat to

white survival *and* its solution. The Ku Klux Klan burns crosses because it wants to cut off and burn black genitals.

Of course, Christ was a black man, and whites secretly know this. When they celebrate the Eucharist and eat the body and blood of Christ they are trying to cure their own whiteness by ingesting part of Christ's blackness.

The story of Adam and Eve is the story of the origin of the white man. Eating the “poison” apple is the equivalent of the genetic mistake that produced albinism. Adam and Eve were then embarrassed by their white skin and tried to cover it. Expulsion from the Garden of Eden is expulsion from Africa. This was “the fall” of the white man, and his albinism and the sex act that reproduces it are “original sin.”

Dr. Welsing's imagination knows no bounds. Romulus and Remus are symbols of the defective, mutant whites who were kicked out of Africa, and had to be suckled by a wolf after they had been “left to the dogs.” Fleece is what grows on the woolly heads of Africans and gold is the color whites think they become when they bake in the sun, so Jason's hunt for the golden fleece was really a search for melanin. The alchemist's hope of turning things into gold was also a quest for melanin. For his entire existence, the white man has been tortured by his own pale inadequacy.


Melanin Theory

But what is so great about melanin, anyway? References to its powers are disappointingly sketchy and come late in the book. Apparently it keeps those who have it in tune with the vibrations of the universe and, in effect, gives them a sixth sense. Dr. Welsing concedes that some non-whites have lost this sense because they have been taught by defective whites, but melanin-virtue can be cultivated. It was the melanin in George Washington Carver's dark skin that helped him communicate directly with plants and make wonderful discoveries.

It is the absence of melanin that makes whites evil. The absence “critically impairs the depth sensitivity of the nervous system.” It is why whites

have invented white supremacy, which is “the greatest known evil on Earth.”

What is to be done? Dr. Welsing writes often about “eliminating” or “neutralizing” this great evil, but she is vague about how to do it. Logically, if whites crave melanin, why not just give it to them? Why not offer to give them the mulatto children they secretly want? The new generation of “people of color” would presumably be a huge improvement over undiluted whites. However, Dr. Welsing never recommends this, and seems to look down on whites who have sex with blacks.



Helpless white phallic symbols.

Are whites simply to be eliminated? At one point she writes, “Black manhood does not mean macho or money, but instead it means *warrior* or *soldier* against white supremacy, embracing everything that the words warrior or soldier imply,” [emphasis in the original] but this is her only flirtation with violence.

With far greater consistency, Dr. Welsing strikes an entirely different theme. “It is much easier for white supremacy to control female-headed households,” she writes, so blacks should form stable couples and take great care in child-rearing. She urges blacks not to have children until they are at least 30 years old, and to have no more than two! This is good advice, but it will not rid the world of albino mutants.

Of one thing, Dr. Welsing is quite sure. No matter what they say or do, whites *never* help non-whites or treat them fairly. “Blacks and other non-whites have failed to understand that if white people were to do this, it would mean active white participation in white genocide.”

Thus, despite the craziness of almost all of her book, Dr. Welsing does recognize certain truths about race that very few whites understand. Non-white immigration and differential birth rates *do* threaten whites with

“genetic annihilation.” By encouraging their own dispossession whites do “participate in white genocide.”

This is why race-chauvinist blacks can never understand white behavior. They cannot imagine it being different from what theirs would be if the racial roles were reversed. Blacks would undoubtedly make short work of any group that was, to them, the social and

racial equivalent of what blacks are to whites. No matter how earnestly whites try to advance the interests of non-whites, racist blacks will always find some way to discredit their motives.

After all, whites are basically simple creatures. Dr. Welsing quotes someone named Needy Fuller who, in 1969,

had one of the key insights on which she bases her “unified field theory.”

“Most white people hate Black people. . . . If you know this about white people, you need know little else. If you do not know this about white people, virtually all else that you know about them will only confuse you.” ●

O Tempora, O Mores!

A Choice, Not an Echo!

Frank Borzellieri, occasional writer for AR and a speaker at the 1996 AR conference, is in a fierce campaign fight for New York City city council. Mr. Borzellieri, who has already won crushing victories in campaigns for school board, is challenging a sitting Republican councilman, Tom Ognibene, whom he calls a “liberal Democratic errand boy.” Mr. Ognibene had made a sweetheart deal with the Democrats to run *unopposed* in the general election, so a win for Mr. Borzellieri in the primary should give him a virtually unopposed shot at city council.

Imagine a speaker at an AR conference on the New York City city council! The media have begun to wake up to what this means, so Mr. Borzellieri’s campaign is the only primary fight to get wide-spread print and TV coverage. In a typical smear job, someone named Albor Ruiz opens his column with the accusation that Mr. Borzellieri “believes that slavery was a good thing.” Only well into the column does it become clear that what Mr. Borzellieri really said is that today’s black Americans are better off here than they would be if their ancestors had stayed in Africa. Mr. Ruiz, of course, wants people to think the candidate wants to *reestablish* slavery.

The campaign has been predictably brutal. Mr. Ognibene has already tried the typical rich-incumbent-bully tactic of a court challenge to the legitimacy of Mr. Borzellieri’s citizen signatures on petitions that give him the right to run. Since the signatures are virtually assured to be found valid in court, this is nothing more than a way to make

Mr. Borzellieri spend his slim resources on lawyers.

The challenger is fighting back the best way he can—door to door. With only a few thousand voters in the primary, it is possible to make a personal appeal to virtually all of them, and Mr. Borzellieri has lost 15 pounds trying to do just that. With his immense popularity among white ethnics as a man who stands for Western Civilization, Mr. Borzellieri not only has a fanatically dedicated group of supporters but a real chance of winning. As the former Queens Republican chairman (and no friend of Mr. Borzellieri) puts it: “[Incumbent] Tom [Ognibene] is in for one helluva fight. Frank [Borzellieri] has his own constituency.” He needs more money, though, which could make all the difference in the home stretch.

The primary is in September. This will be a race to watch.

Entrepreneurial Spirit

Former South African first lady Winnie Mandela has decided to make a buck on her now-sour relationship with Nelson. She is selling little bottles of soil from under the Soweto house

house. Miss Mandela has turned the garage into a gift shop, and is promoting guided tours of what promises to be an important South African tourist attraction. (Winnie Mandela Sells Bottles of Soil to Tourists, Jet, May 12, 1997.)


The Undeclared War

Three white Michigan teen-agers who hopped a slow-moving freight train got a surprise when they got off by mistake in a black ghetto. The two boys, aged 14 and 15, and a 14-year-old girl overshot their rural, mostly-white destination of Holly, Michigan, and found themselves in a derelict part of Flint called “the Strip.”

They set off into the dark looking for a pay phone, and were “befriended” by six young blacks who led them to a deserted park. The blacks pistol-whipped and gang-raped the girl while they threatened the boys with a shotgun. Then they forced the three to lie down while one shot the boys in the backs of their heads, execution-style with a 22-calibre pistol, and then shot the girl in the face. They left the whites for dead, after robbing them—of ten dollars.

One of the boys died, but the other boy and the girl staggered out of the park covered in blood, the girl dressed only in a white T-shirt. They made it to a highway where a black truck driver finally rescued them. He later said he was worried about what two white kids were “doing down here at this time of the night.”

One resident of “the Strip” has a straightforward explanation for what happened: “They would have stuck out like a sore thumb, three white kids in this neighborhood—they’d be sit-



she shared with Mr. Mandela in the 1950s. At \$11.00 each, the bottles come with signed certificates of authenticity and a short history of the

ting ducks." But a hate crime? Hardly. No dispatches—almost all local—have used the phrase and some news reports have not mentioned race at all. Not one of the six blacks charged with the crime, who range in ages from 16 to 23, had a criminal record. (Brian Murphy, 6 Charged in Attack on Teens, *Detroit Free Press*, June 24, 1997, p. 1A. Brian Harmon and Ron French, Attack on 3 Teens in Flint Netted \$10, *Detroit News*, June 24, 1997.)

Slavery in Florida

The Mexican deaf-mutes held in captivity in New York City and forced to work in the subways have attracted headlines, but this sort of thing is not so rare among immigrants. In a typical case last year, a Miami-area couple pleaded guilty to enslaving a woman. Kishin Mahtani and Shashi Gobindram, held a 23-year-old woman from India in their home against her will for seven months. They burned her passport and address book, and forced her to work 16-hour days. They disciplined her by beating and burning her, and holding her head under water. (Couple Plead Guilty to Enslaving Servant, *Chicago Tribune*, Dec. 6, 1996, p. 6.)

Yearning to be Black

Mostafa Hefny is a 46-year-old naturalized U.S. citizen, originally from Egypt. He has negroid features more pronounced than those of, say, Colin Powell, but since Egyptians do not get racial preferences, he is suing to be considered black. (John Hughes, Man Sues to Change Federal Racial Definitions, *Detroit Free Press*, June 5, 1997, p. 17A.)

"Inundate Europe and America"

Last May, Indonesian Prime Minister Mahathir bin Muhammed was the keynote speaker at the Southern African International Dialogue held in Botswana. To an enthusiastic audience that included the heads of government of 12 African nations, Dr. Mahathir argued that "the north" is intent on recolonising "the south" by means of "globalization." If the Third

World is not offered its rightful share of global wealth it should use "people mobility" as the ultimate weapon: "We should migrate North in the millions, legally or illegally . . . Masses of Asians and Africans should inundate Europe and America." (Ian Stewart, Mahathir Warns of Migrant Flood, *The Australian*, May 7, 1997.)

Life Among the Savages

Dianna Meeks is a 25-year-old mother of four children who range in age from 6 years to 17 months. In March she had a fifth child, who was premature and weighed 5 pounds 11 ounces. She named him Dontory. By the time Dontory was two months old he had lost nearly 50 percent of his body weight and was down to three pounds. When Miss Meeks took him in for a checkup, the doctor ordered her to take Dontory to the hospital immediately and even wrote out directions how to get there. Instead, Miss Meeks left the baby with a sister and went shopping. Later she took Dontory along with her four other children to a nail care salon, where Dontory died. A post mortem showed no evidence of food in his system. Miss Meeks explained that she did not go to the hospital because she was afraid she might be accused of maltreating her child and might lose public assistance. She has been charged with involuntary manslaughter, but faces no more than five years in prison. (Herbert McCann, AP, Chicago, May 26, 1997.)

Wicked Whites

In what may be a first, a white Christian denomination has been found guilty of racial discrimination against a white minister. John Shirkey, who has spent most of his 30-year career working in the worst neighborhoods of Baltimore and Washington, applied for a position with the United Methodist Church's Black Community Developer program, which was established to help "confront racism" and spiff up rundown neighborhoods. However, he learned that the church had a policy according to which "The community developer will be from the indigenous population," and appears to have been denied the

job on this basis. A jury awarded him \$180,000. (Minister Vindicated in Lawsuit, AP, Baltimore, May 31, 1997.)

Facing the Future

Moko, the Maori tradition of face tattooing, is making a comeback. New Zealand natives traditionally sported elaborate, swirling tattoos, and in the 19th century Moko took on additional meaning as a sign of anti-white resistance. It all but died out in the 1920s,



but is being revived for nationalistic reasons. "This is the direction to Maori freedom, self-determination and sovereignty . . . It is how we, as Maori, can revive and express our view of the right to self-determination," explains a young enthusiast. Some of the early pioneers were gang members and outcasts, but Moko is rapidly moving up-scale. Two Maori members of the New Zealand parliament are reportedly thinking of "taking the Moko," and activists look forward to the day when much of the middle class sports tattoos. (Simon Louisson, Reuter, Moko Face Tattooing Part of Maori Renaissance, Jun. 5, 1997.)

Death to the White Man

Janet Reno wants affirmative action for whites—on death row. Under new guidelines she established in 1995 to ensure "consistency and fairness," she has tripled the rate at which whites who commit federal crimes face capital charges. She has accomplished this mainly by consolidating prosecution decisions in Washington. Traditionally, local federal prosecutors decided

whether they would seek the death penalty, but now Washington decides. Miss Reno has ordered her "death penalty committee" *explicitly* to consider races of victim and perpetrator in reaching decisions.

As one experienced assistant state attorney general says, "It seems to me to be an invitation to do exactly the thing you're told you can't do—consider race when you decide whether to seek the death penalty or not." Vivian Berger, assistant dean of Columbia University law school says she can imagine some federal bureaucrat saying, "Now we should prosecute some white defendant capitally because we haven't done any whites lately." Fortunately, only a small minority of death penalty cases involve federal crimes. Most are state matters and are beyond Miss Reno's grasp.

In the past, the federal government showed no apparent racial bias against non-whites. Of the 34 criminals it executed between 1927 and 1963, 27 were white. However, since the death penalty was revived in 1988, it has taken on a pattern that Miss Reno finds offensive. Only one of the 12 civilians now awaiting execution for federal crimes is white. Nine are black, one is Asian and one is Hispanic. (Frank Murray, *Reno Seeking More Executions Among White U.S. Defendants*, Washington Times, June 17, 1997.)

Go Native, Go Extinct

It has become fashionable among liberal white South Africans to adopt black babies. As the *Times* of London reports:

"Three years after Nelson Mandela was elected as South Africa's first black president, hundreds of white couples are trying to adopt abandoned black babies because it 'makes them feel like they belong in the new South Africa,' according to one sociologist. 'These people are riddled with angst and guilt about their role in the country today. Some of them were involved in the freedom struggle against white minority rule and now want to prove themselves even more by adopting a black child.'"

Trans-racial adoptions were illegal under apartheid, and many black activists are appalled at what they see as looming "cultural genocide." How-

AR is Hiring

AR is still looking for an Assistant Editor. Candidates should write well, but intelligence, commitment, and resourcefulness are more important than experience. The job includes promotion, office management, computer work, etc. Experience would be appreciated but we will train a very bright beginner. Please send resume and clips to: AR, Box 527, Oakton, VA 22124.

ever, because of the Mandela-era chaos the number of abandoned black babies has quadrupled in the last three years. The increased supply has been met by a rising demand among whites, many of whom can have children of their own but want a black baby to "complete" their families. (Andrew Malone, 'Guilt Trip' Whites Adopt Black Babies, *The Times* (London), June 22, 1997.)

Polluted Justice

Like so many other companies, Chevron Corporation has been sued for "environmental racism." In this case, the "racism" dates back to the 1920s, when Gulf Oil stored oil in pits in the Houston area. Gulf later sold the land to a developer who planned to build a "Negro" neighborhood on the site. Some of the oil has allegedly seeped into the water supply where it is said to cause cancer, lupus, and other unpleasantness. Chevron is now on the hook because it acquired Gulf Oil.

In August, the case was halted in mid-trial when the presiding judge, Kenneth Hoyt, questioned whether an Arthritis Foundation study on lupus rates among blacks could be admitted as evidence "because white people wrote it." Chevron maintains that the black judge has shown consistent prejudice against whites and against the company. The trial was likely to continue under a different judge.

In other on-the-record observations in the case, Judge Hoyt has shown an interest in the evolutionary origins of racial differences:

"Why do you think Chinese people are so short? Because there is so much damn wind over there they need to be short. Why are they so tall in Africa? Because they need to be tall. It's environmental.

"I mean, you don't jump up and get a banana off a tree if you're only four feet. If you're seven feet tall and you're standing in China, then you're going to get blown away by that Siberian wind, aren't you?" (Reuter, Houston, *Racially Charged Chevron Pollution Case Halted*, Aug. 2, 1997.)

Patriots All

Last summer, when Congress passed a law that would make legal immigrants ineligible for most welfare programs, there was a huge rush of applications for citizenship. After all, 725,000 immigrants receiving Supplemental Security Income (SSI) payments alone, and many of them wanted to keep their snouts in the public trough. Now that Congress has decided to restore benefits to aliens, the rush is over. Groups hurriedly set up to help foreigners become American now have nothing to do, and English classes have emptied. Many immigrants who set the citizenship process in motion have now asked for their application papers back. (Ken McLaughlin & Ariana Cha, *Bay Area Agencies Link Drop to Vow to Restore Benefits*, San Jose Mercury News, July 31, 1997. Annie Nakao, *Rush To Become Citizens Slowing*, Aid Groups Say, San Francisco Examiner, July 30, 1997.)

Walking Streets No More

Pedro Rosario of Boston raped a 33-year-old woman in 1991 but served only 2-1/2 years of his 10-year sentence. In 1995, he raped an Irish college student and then cut her throat. In June, he was finally sentenced to life in prison without parole. Ironically, at the time of the rape/murder, Mr. Rosario was the subject of a man-in-the-street TV news interview about the crime. "You can't even walk the streets no more," he complained to Boston viewers. (Paroled Rapist Murdered Second Victim, *NRA CrimeStrike's Crime Watch Weekly*, Vol. 3, No. 25, June 24, 1997.) ●